

bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-6 F33, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by telephone at (301) 415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-2323 Filed 1-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-282]

### Northern States Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-42; Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-42 issued to Northern States Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendment would initiate a one-time only change for Prairie Island Unit 1 Cycle 19 that would allow the use of the moveable incore detector system for measurement of the core peaking factors with less than 75% and greater than or equal to 50% of the detector thimbles available.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of

a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve an increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. The moveable incore detector system is used only to provide confirmatory information on the neutron flux distribution and is not required for the daily safe operation of the core. The system is not a process variable that is an initial condition in the accident analyses. The only accident that the moveable incore detector system could be involved in is the breaching of the detector thimbles which would be enveloped by the small break loss of coolant accident (LOCA) analysis. As the proposed changes do not involve any changes to the system's equipment and no equipment is operated in a new or more harmful manner, there is no increase in the probability of such an accident.

The proposed [amendment] would not involve an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The moveable incore detector system provides a monitoring function that is not used for accident mitigation (the system is not used in the primary success path for mitigation of a design basis accident). The ability of the reactor protection system or engineered safety features system instrumentation to mitigate the consequences of an accident will not be impaired by the proposed changes. The small break LOCA analysis (and thus its consequences) continues to bound potential breaching of the system's detector thimbles.

With greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the detector thimbles available, core peaking factor measurement uncertainties will be increased, which could impact the core peaking factors and as a result could affect the consequences of certain accidents. However, any changes in the core peaking factors resulting from increased measurement uncertainties will be compensated for by conservative measurement uncertainty adjustments in the Technical Specifications to ensure that pertinent core design parameters are maintained. Sufficient additional penalty is added to the power distribution measurements such that this change will not impact the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed [amendment] would not create the possibility of a new or different

kind of accident previously evaluated as [it] only affect[s] the minimum complement of equipment necessary for operability of the moveable incore detector system. There is no change in plant configuration, equipment or equipment design. No equipment is operated in a new manner. Thus the changes will not create any new or different accident causal mechanisms. The accident analysis in the Updated Safety Analysis Report remains bounding.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The reduction in the minimum complement of equipment necessary for the operability of the moveable incore detector system could only impact the monitoring/calibration functions of the system. Reduction of the number of available moveable incore detector thimbles to the 50% level does not significantly degrade the ability of the system to measure core power distributions. With greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the detector thimbles available, core peaking factor measurement uncertainties will be increased, but will be compensated for by conservative measurement uncertainty adjustments in the Technical Specifications to ensure that pertinent core design parameters are maintained. Sufficient additional penalty is added to the power distribution measurements such that this change does not impact the safety margins which currently exist. Also, the reduction of available detector thimbles has negligible impact on the quadrant power tilt and core average axial power shape measurements. Sufficient detector thimbles will be available to ensure that no quadrant will be unmonitored.

Based on these factors, the proposed changes in this license amendment will not result in a significant reduction in the plant's margin of safety, as the core will continue to be adequately monitored.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would

result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 2, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the

designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by close of business on the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Untimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 15, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Beth A. Wetzel,**

*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-2325 Filed 1-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-346]

### Toledo Edison Company; Centerior Service Company; and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company; Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations with respect to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, issued to Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees), for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensees from the requirement to have an oil collection system for the reactor coolant pump (RCP) lube oil addition system, provided certain compensatory actions are taken, thus allowing the licensees to utilize remote lube oil fill lines at power. This requirement is contained in 10 CFR part 50, Appendix R, Section III.O, which provides that licensees shall have a collection system "capable of collecting lube oil from all potential pressurized and unpressurized leakage sites in the reactor coolant pump lube oil systems." It also specifies that "leakage points to be protected shall include lift pump and piping, overflow lines, lube oil cooler, oil fill and drain lines and plugs, flanged connections on oil lines, and lube oil reservoirs where such features exist on the reactor coolant pumps."

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensees' application for exemption dated November 18, 1997, as supplemented by facsimile dated December 9, 1997.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to reduce dose and personnel hazards to

workers who periodically add oil to the RCP lube oil system during power operation.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20.

The proposed action will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents or result in a change in occupational or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no radiological impacts associated with the proposed action. In addition, the proposed action will not result in a change in nonradiological plant effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no environmental impacts associated with this action.

##### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

##### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of Davis-Besse dated October 1975.

##### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 9, 1997, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, Carol O'Claire, of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

##### Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to

prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensees' letter dated November 18, 1997, and facsimile dated December 9, 1997, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, OH 43606.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard P. Savio,**

*Acting Director, Project Directorate III-3, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-2324 Filed 1-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes: Meeting Notice

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission will convene a meeting of a sub-committee of the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) on February 12, and 13, 1998. The meeting will take place at the address provided below. All sessions of the meeting will be open to the public.

Topic of discussion will be the proposed rule text for the revision of 10 CFR Part 35 and associated guidance.

**DATES:** On February 12, 1998, the meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 5:00 p.m. On February 13, 1998, the meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3:00 p.m.

**ADDRESS:** Leonard C. Ferguson Cancer Center, 1163 W. Stephenson Street, Freeport, IL 61032.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patricia Vacherlon, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, MS T8F5, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415-6376.

#### Conduct of the Meeting

Dr. Judith Stitt will chair the meeting. Dr. Stitt will conduct the meeting in a manner that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. The following